

## Changes in Blood Pressure and Arterial Hemodynamics following Living Kidney Donation

Price, Anna; Greenhall, George; Moody, William; Steeds, Richard; Mark, Patrick B; Edwards, Nicky; Hayer, Manvir; Pickup, Luke; Radhakrishnan, Ashwin; Law, Jonathan; Banerjee, Debasish; Campbell, Tunde; Tomson, Charles; Cockcroft, John; Shrestha, Badri; Wilkinson, Ian B; Tomlinson, Laurie ; Ferro, Charles; Townend, Jon

DOI:

[10.2215/CJN.15651219](https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.15651219)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Other version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Price, A, Greenhall, G, Moody, W, Steeds, R, Mark, PB, Edwards, N, Hayer, M, Pickup, L, Radhakrishnan, A, Law, J, Banerjee, D, Campbell, T, Tomson, C, Cockcroft, J, Shrestha, B, Wilkinson, IB, Tomlinson, L, Ferro, C & Townend, J 2020, 'Changes in Blood Pressure and Arterial Hemodynamics following Living Kidney Donation', *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 1330-1339.  
<https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.15651219>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Download date: 05. May. 2023

## Supplemental data

### Table of Contents

**Table S1:** Baseline characteristics of patients who were lost to follow up compared to those who continued the study.

**Table S2:** Baseline patient demographics of the whole cohort recruited.

**Table S3:** Baseline biochemical and hemodynamic characteristics of the whole cohort recruited.

**Table S4:** Linear regression model: Association between 12 month change in adjusted pulse wave velocity and kidney donation, age, sex and smoking status.

**Table S1:** Baseline characteristics of patients who were lost to follow up compared to those who continued the study.

Baseline characteristics	Attended follow up All=306 (68%)	Lost to follow up			P value*
		All=141 (32%)	Donors n=78	Controls n=63	
Living kidney donor	168 (55)	78 (55)			0.93
Sex (male)	135 (44)	50 (35)	28 (36)	22 (35)	0.40
Age (years)	50 ± 13	47 ± 13	50 ± 12	44 ± 12	0.05
Race	Caucasian=285 (93) Non-white=17 (6) Unknown=4 (1)	Caucasian=108 (77) Non-white=17 (12) Unknown=16 (11)	Caucasian=64 (82) Non-white=4 (5) Unknown=10 (13)	Caucasian=44 (70) Non-white=13 (21) Unknown=6 (9)	<b>0.04</b>
Weight (kg)	75.1 ± 13.6	76.4 ± 13.6	77.2 ± 13	75.2 ± 13	0.38
eGFR (ml/min/1.73 <sup>2</sup> )	93 ± 15	97 ± 15	96 ± 15	99 ± 14	<b>0.008</b>
History of hypertension	26 (9)	9 (6)	7 (9)	2 (3)	0.08
Anti-hypertensive usage	27 (19)	8 (6)	6 (8)	2 (3)	<b>0.04</b>
Current or ex-smoker	112 (37)	68 (48)	39 (50)	29 (46)	<b>0.006</b>
ACE/ARB usage	8 (3)	2 (1)	1	1	0.29
Calcium channel blocker usage	10 (3)	4 (3)	3 (4)	1 (1)	0.62

ACE; Angiotensin Converting Enzyme. ARB; Angiotensin receptor blocker. eGFR; estimated glomerular filtration rate.

\* A comparison was made between all those lost to follow up n=141 compared to all those who followed up n=306. Categorical variables are presented as n (valid %) and were analysed using Chi squared tests. Continuous data are represented as mean ± standard deviation if normally distributed and were analysed using independent samples *t*-tests.

**Table S2:** Baseline patient demographics of the whole cohort recruited.

Variable Sample size =n	Controls	Donors	P value †
<b>Male sex</b> Donors n=246 Controls n=201	79 (39)	106 (43)	0.40
<b>Age, years</b> Donors n=239 Controls n=195	47 ± 14	51 ± 12	<b>0.003</b>
<b>Race</b> Donors n=246 Controls n=201	Caucasian=171 (85) Non-white=21 (10) Unknown= 9 (5)	Caucasian=222 (90) Non-white=13 (5) Unknown=11 (5)	<b>0.04</b>
<b>Previous history of hypertension</b> Donors n=232 Controls n=194	11 (6)	24 (10)	0.08
<b>Anti-hypertensive usage</b> Donors n=173 Controls n=159	11 (7)	24 (14)	<b>0.04</b>
<b>ACE/ARB usage</b> Donors n=246 Controls n=201	5 (2)	7 (3)	0.67
<b>Calcium channel blocker usage</b> Donors n=246 Controls n=201	5 (2)	9 (4)	0.62
<b>eGFR (ml/min/1.73<sup>2</sup>) ‡</b> Donors n=231 Controls n=181	96 ± 15	93 ± 15	<b>0.04</b>
<b>Weight, kg</b> Donors n=237 Controls n=193	74.8 ± 13.8	76 ± 13.5	0.38
<b>Current or ex-smoker</b> Donors n=246 Controls n=193	67 (33)	113 (46)	<b>0.007</b>
<b>Normalised isotopic GFR (ml/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup>)</b> Donors n=115 Controls n=24	89 ± 13	89 ± 12	0.88

ACE; Angiotensin Converting Enzyme. ARB; Angiotensin receptor blocker. CKD; Chronic Kidney Disease. eGFR; Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate.

447 participants recruited into the study with valid data sets are represented.

† Categorical variables are presented as n (valid %) and were analysed using Chi squared tests for categorical variables. Continuous data are represented as mean ± standard deviation if normally distributed and were analysed using independent samples *t*-tests.

‡ eGFR was calculated using the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equation (2009).

**Table S3:** Baseline biochemical and haemodynamic characteristics of the whole cohort recruited.\*

Variable	Controls	Donors	<i>P</i> value †
<b>Sodium (meq/L)</b> Donors n=232 Controls n=184	141 ± 2	140 ± 2	0.15
<b>Potassium (meq/L)</b> Donors n=231 Controls n=183	4.2 ± 0.3	4.3 ± 0.3	<b>0.04</b>
<b>Urea (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=232 Controls n=184	30 ± 8	30 ± 8	0.66
<b>Creatinine (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=232 Controls n=182	0.8 ± 0.2	0.8 ± 0.2	0.29
<b>Albumin (g/dL)</b> Donors n=217 Controls n=183	4.6 ± 0.5	4.3 ± 0.4	<b>0.006</b>
<b>Corrected calcium (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=217 Controls n=183	9.2 ± 0.4	9.2 ± 0.4	0.24
<b>Phosphate (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=198 Controls n=175	3.4 ± 0.6	3.4 ± 0.6	0.15
<b>Magnesium (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=123 Controls n=114	2.8 ± 0.3	2.8 ± 0.3	0.64
<b>Uric acid (mg/dL)</b> Donors n=121 Controls n=127	4.8 ± 1.1	5.0 ± 1.2	0.18
<b>Urine albumin: creatinine ratio (mg/g)</b> Donors n=126 Controls n=125	27 ± 57	25 ± 47	0.78
<b>Seated office systolic BP (mmHg)</b> Donors n=234 Controls n=195	125 ± 16	126 ± 14	0.64
<b>Seated office diastolic BP (mmHg)</b> Donors n=233 Controls n=194	77 ± 10	78 ± 9	0.19
<b>Ambulatory day systolic BP (mmHg)</b> Donors n=174 Controls n=158	123 ± 10	124 ± 10	0.56
<b>Ambulatory day diastolic BP (mmHg)</b>	78 ± 9	79 ± 8	0.36

## The EARNEST study

Donors n=174 Controls n=158			
<b>Ambulatory day heart rate (bpm)</b>	73 ± 9	74 ± 11	0.49
Donors n=109 Controls n=124			
<b>Ambulatory night systolic BP (mmHg)</b>	111 ± 12	112 ± 11	0.74
Donors n=169 Controls n=156			
<b>Ambulatory night diastolic BP (mmHg)</b>	67 ± 8	67 ± 9	0.57
Donors n=169 Controls n=156			
<b>Central systolic BP (mmHg)</b>	110 ± 16	113 ± 13	<b>0.04</b>
Donors n=142 Controls n=148			
<b>Central diastolic BP (mmHg)</b>	75 ± 10	77 ± 8	0.06
Donors n=142 Controls n=148			
<b>Augmentation index, corrected for heart rate (%)</b>	20 ± 13	23 ± 15	0.10
Donors n=140 Controls n=148			
<b>Adjusted carotid-femoral pulse wave velocity (m/s)</b>	6.9 ± 1.3	7.0 ± 1.4	0.66
Donors n=200 Controls n=174			

BPM; Beats per minute. BP; Blood Pressure, CI; Confidence interval.

\*447 participants recruited into the study with valid data sets are represented.

† Continuous data are represented as mean ± standard deviation if normally distributed.

Independent samples *t*-tests (controls vs. donors) were used to compare variables at baseline between donors and controls.

**Table S4: Linear regression model: Association between 12 month change in adjusted pulse wave velocity and kidney donation, age, sex and smoking status.**

	Univariable analysis				Multivariable analysis			
	$\beta$	CI	$P$		$\beta$	CI	$P$	
Donor	0.083	-0.155	0.323	0.49	0.098	-0.147	0.343	0.43
Age (years) at baseline	-0.003	-0.012	0.005	0.48	-0.003	-0.012	0.005	0.47
Female	-0.067	-0.307	0.172	0.57	-0.074	-0.318	0.170	0.55
Current or ex-smoker at baseline	-0.065	-0.312	0.182	0.60	-0.089	-0.345	0.165	0.49

$\beta$ ;Beta coefficient; CI; Confidence interval. PWV; Pulse wave velocity.

Multivariable analysis shows mutually adjusted coefficients for each independent variable.

Coefficients are given per unit change e.g. per year for age. Linear regression was used for all participants with both baseline and follow up data for PWV i.e. change in PWV (Living kidney donors n=168, Controls n=138). Pulse wave velocity has been adjusted for mean heart rate and mean arterial pressure as previously described. Variables chosen for the multivariable model were based on clinical relevance and known factors influencing PWV.